

## COMMUNITY WORKING GROUP MEETING MINUTES

**DATE OF MEETING:** June 18, 2009 1:00 PM

**DATE OF ISSUANCE:**

**PREPARED BY:**

**RE: PHASE I ENGINEERING**

**FAP 591 (US 34)**

**JOB NO.: P-93-015-06, PTB 147-20**

**CONTRACT NO. 66847**

**Epstein PN 28306**

### Attendees

David Alexander	IDOT District 3
Dave Broviak	IDOT District 3
Rick Powell	IDOT District 3
Theresa Pelletier	Epstein
Teresa Townsend	Planning Communities, LLC
Bill Higgins	Planning Communities, LLC
Matt Nelson	Planning Communities, LLC
Art Sheridan	City of Plano
Starr Frederick	Sandwich Park District
Mike Muzzilo	Valley West Hospital
Jim Teckenbrock	Sandwich Economic Development Corp
Becky Lueken	Country Market
David Luttrell	LDL Transfer
Mike Luttrell	LDL Transfer
Joan Hardekopf	Sandwich Historical Society
Vicki Schuler	Chamber of Commerce
Tom Horak	City of Sandwich

### 1. Introduction

The CWG #3 meeting was opened by IDOT Representative/Project Manager, David Alexander. The project team was reintroduced.

### 2. Project and Outreach Report

Theresa Pelletier, Consultant Project Manager with Epstein, reviewed the overall progress and outreach efforts of the project since the last CWG meeting in March.

Public Workshop #1 was held on April 23, 2009 and resulted in a good turnout of over 70 people. The displays and exhibits for the workshop were designed and setup to walk attendees through the CSS process similar to the exercises and facilitation of the CWG meetings. Attendees had opportunities to refine the Vision Statement, add/revise problems and issues to the Problem Identification Board and add/revise Evaluation Criteria as defined by the CWG and PSG meetings to date.

Other outreach since the last CWG meeting in March, included a project team presentation to the elected officials of Sandwich and IDOT participation in a cultural fair held by Sandwich's Hispanic Community.

### **3. Summary of PSG #2**

An overview of the PSG #2 meeting was presented to the CWG Members. The last PSG meeting was held June 11, 2009. Information from the March CWG meeting as well as the Public Workshop was presented in order to define/refine any additional evaluation criteria and project alternatives. The PSG added 2 alternatives to consider, a no build and a no build with off system improvements.

Evaluation criteria from the PSG was presented and reviewed by the CWG members.

### **4. Study/Analyses Overview:**

Theresa Pellitier presented an overview of all the traffic and transportation related studies conducted to date.

24 hour automated traffic counts were taken at locations along US 34. From this data, a peak hour was identified. Manual counts were taken at all signalized intersections during the peak hour. Peak hour volumes were utilized to perform traffic analysis using Highway Capacity Software. Level of Service (LOS) rating system is the system utilized for traffic engineering. A roadway segment or intersection is given a LOS rating which reflects its performance or its ability to accommodate the traffic demand. LOS is expressed in letter grades similar to school where an "A" is very good and "E" or "F" are failing. The lowest grade for a roadway segment is "E". The lowest grade for an intersection is "F". The Segment Analysis results show that the existing US Route 34 is operating at a LOS of "E" the lowest rating available. The Intersection Analysis results show that intersection performance varies from "A" to "C" in the morning peak hour and A to F in the evening peak hour. (see summary of Traffic Analysis Results). These results indicate that the performance of US 34 is currently controlled by the segments and not by the intersections. Stated another way; the number of lanes is insufficient to accommodate the existing level of traffic. This is true in 3 lane sections of US 34 as well as 2 lane sections.

Traffic projections for the design year of 2035 were estimated using an annual growth rate of 2.31%. The growth rate was provided by IDOT and is based on historical data. This results in an approximate 80% increase in traffic from 2009 to 2035. All segments of US 34 exhibit LOS "E" in 2035 with even greater congestion indicated. Projected intersection performance in 2035 indicate LOS "A" to "F" in the morning peak and "A" to "F" in the evening peak with all intersections experiencing a decrease in performance.

A previously prepared Bicycle Analysis performed as part of the Study indicated that there is a demand for bicycle infrastructure in the area. Comments from CWG members (AL & Mike) agreed and affirmed this finding. They indicated that even if the demand is projected for some

years in the future, it would be better to implement planning for bicycle lanes now rather than having to add them later.

Crash Analysis indicated that the vast majority of accidents in the study area have been rear-ending crashes without injury. This type of accident is typical in areas of high traffic congestion.

## 5. Evaluation Criteria Refinement

Teresa Townsend reviewed the CSS Process to date including any additions and refinements to the Vision Statement, Problem Identification and Evaluation Criteria received from the PSG and Public Workshop.

The group discussed the existing Criteria List and reviewed the additional comments added by the PSG. Teresa facilitated a discussion/exercise to assist the group in narrowing down and refining the list to create a set of workable evaluation criteria that would be used to determine preferred alternatives of the group. Upon discussion, three were removed due to redundancy, combination with other criteria, or because they are “standard criteria” in design. After all criteria were completely explained, understood, and agreed upon; each CWG member was given 5 sticker dots to place over their top five criteria. Their dot-votes are tallied below. (Removed criteria have been struck-through.)

Dot-vote Tally					
	Criteria (CWG)	Dots		Criteria (PSG)	Dots
1	Improve traffic flow	6	18	Roadway speed matches surroundings	0
2	Accommodate and provide for a variety of traffic (trucks, bicycles, pedestrians, passenger vehicles)	8	19	Minimize environmental impacts	1
3	Preserve community character	1	20	Traffic safety	1
4	Serve its primary function of connectivity within the city and the region	2	21	Cost	2
5	Accommodate utility upgrades	6	22	Meet IDOT Policy	0
6	Make the roadway crossable by senior citizens and children	2	23	Continuity of user expectation	0
7	<del>Provide for railroad safety</del>	✖	24	Continuity of section	0
8	<del>Accommodate hearing impaired populations</del>	✖	25	Site Distance	1
9	Accommodate emergency vehicles	3			
10	Minimize displacements	3			
11	Provide adequate drainage	7			
12	Minimize impact to traffic during construction	2			
13	Minimize impacts to parking and accommodate parking in design	3			
14	Provide a quality roadway with lifetime pavement design	1			
15	Provide adequate lighting	4			
16	Support economic sustainability	2			
17	ADA Compliant	✖			

---Break---

## 6. Concept Alternatives

Theresa Pelletier reviewed the concept alternatives defined to date. Each participant was given a packet explaining all alternatives.

Major categories include:

- A) No-build
- B) No Build with improvements to existing overall street features, utilities, etc.;
- C) Widen existing road to 3, 4, or 5 lanes with alternative alignment options;
- D) Bypass utilizing either Lions Road or County Line Road to the south or Chicago Avenue to the North
- E) One-way couple system utilizing either Center Street or Railroad Street for westbound traffic and existing US 34 for eastbound traffic.

## 7. Refinement of Alternatives

Teresa Townsend guided the conversation and a consensus building process to narrow down the larger list of potential alternatives to those preferred by the CWG members.

Rick Powell stated that, over time, bypasses often become congested and less effective unless access to adjacent development is controlled.

Teresa began by having everyone read the descriptions in detail and determine which one was their favored concept alternative on the sheet. The member's individual answers were then shared with the larger group. The group unanimously favored different versions of the Widening Alternative on the initial round of discussion.

Further discussion commenced about the overall impact of widening the road. Theresa presented maps showing how different alignment options could impact existing buildings. These buildings would either have to be removed or modified. Various configurations yielded different results.

This information changed the opinion of some of the group member's favorite selections. The group agreed overall that widening was still the preferred option, but certain alignments would be more palatable for the greater good. While the group recognized that this design direction may lead to the removal of some buildings, they expressed that it would create a better overall benefit to the entire business community and study area.

Results are as follows:

Participant	Favored Initial Alternative	After Review
1	4A	
2	3A	4A
3	4A	
4	2 (3A close)	4A
5	3A	4A
6	2 or 3A	4A
7	4A	
8	2, 3, 4	3 & 4
9	4B	
10	4A	
11	4	

These results show consensus on the following:

- a. Bypass and One-Way couple options were not favored by the CWG;
- b. No Build will always be considered as an option, though not favored by the CWG;
- c. One-Way couples should still be considered, due to the public interest in this option;
- d. The 5-Lane centered option (4A) creates the most displacements, compared to moving the alignment North or South. There may be an opportunity to adjust the alignment as needed to minimize impacts to existing buildings;
- e. CWG members indicated that they would prefer to keep traffic through downtown for economic reasons. They perceive that routing traffic outside of the downtown area could hurt local businesses;

#### 8. Evaluation Criteria and Alternative Crosscheck

Participants were provided a matrix of refined evaluation criteria with defined alternatives to “crosscheck” whether their favored alternatives met evaluation criteria as earlier set by the group. Teresa handed out an evaluation criteria matrix to compare with group’s preferred alternatives and assess if the alternatives did indeed meet the criteria defined. Members

individually reviewed the criteria with the favored alternatives and then discussed their answers with the larger group. Results from the discussion are shown below.

		3A	4A	4B
1	Improve traffic flow	X	X	X
2	Accommodate and provide for a variety of traffic (trucks, bicycles, pedestrians, passenger vehicles)		X	X
3	Preserve community character	X		
4	Serve its primary function of connectivity within the city and the region		X	X
5	Accommodate utility upgrades		X	X
6	Make the roadway crossable by senior citizens and children	X	X	X
7	<del>Provide for railroad safety</del>	-	-	-
8	<del>Accommodate hearing impaired populations</del>	-	-	-
9	Accommodate emergency vehicles		X	X
10	Minimize displacements	X		
11	Provide adequate drainage		X	X
12	Minimize impact to traffic during construction		X	X
13	Minimize impacts to parking and accommodate parking in design	X	X	X
14	Provide a quality roadway with lifetime pavement design	X	X	X
15	Provide adequate lighting	X	X	X
16	Support economic sustainability	X	X	X
17	<del>ADA Compliant</del>	-	-	-
18	Roadway speed matches surroundings		X	X
19	Minimize environmental impacts	X		
20	Traffic safety			
21	Cost	X		
22	Meet IDOT Policy			
23	Continuity of user expectation		X	X
24	Continuity of section		X	X
25	Site Distance			

## 9. CWG #3 WrapUp

The CWG Members achieved several objectives of the meeting and very quickly reached overall consensus on the favored alternatives of the group. The results of this meeting will be shared with the PSG members as well as in the upcoming Public Workshop to be held on July 30, 2009.

CWG Meeting #4 will be in September 2009 (2<sup>nd</sup> half of month due to Fair)

## 10. The meeting adjourned at 3:30PM